

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/646,226	Applicant(s) OKAE ET AL.
	Examiner Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer	Art Unit 1795

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet

/Susy Tsang-Foster/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not convincing. On page 7, Applicant argues that the examiner's assertion that lithium iron phosphate is inherently olivine is not valid, instead arguing that "the same chemical formula can have multiple crystalline forms." The examiner is not convinced that lithium iron phosphate can have multiple crystalline forms, since Applicant has not provided proof of other crystalline forms. Additionally, Applicant is directed to Chalmoner-Gill et al. (US 2002/0192137) at paragraph [0126], where it is stated that crystalline lithium iron phosphate has an olivine structure.

As for Applicant's statement that the examiner did not consider the thickness of the coating, the examiner explains that the particle size of the LiFePO₄ particles falls within the claimed thickness range. When the particles themselves are considered the coating as is explained in the Final Rejection of May 14, 2008 (see top of page 3).

Concerning Applicant's arguments to the limitations of now-cancelled claims 11 and 15, the examiner is unconvinced. Applicant asserts that specific weight percent values taught in the prior art are "not remotely close" to the claimed range. While the examiner does not disagree, the examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to find the optimum value for the weight percent, as explained in the Final Rejection (see bottom of page 3).

Continuation of 13. Other: the amendments raise new issues because the scope of claims dependent from the amended claims are altered. For example, the scope of claim 7 is changed because it was not considered with the limitations from claim 11 were not included in claim 6.

Additionally, Applicant stated in the remarks that a Supplemental Response was filed on January 25, 2006. The examiner believes that applicants meant to say that the Supplemental Response was filed January 25, 2008. Regardless, no such response is found in public pair. It was checked most recently on August 22, 2008.